



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

92

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/932,431	08/17/2001	Gary Stephen Shuster	409475-40	3441

58688 7590 02/08/2007
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
P.O. BOX 2207
WILMINGTON, DE 19899

EXAMINER

BILGRAMI, ASGHAR H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
2 MONTHS	02/08/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

FEB 08 2007

Technology Center 2100

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/932,431

Filing Date: August 17, 2001

Appellant(s): SHUSTER, GARY STEPHEN

Jonathan Jaech
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed September 1, 2006 appealing from the Office action mailed June 3, 2005.

(1) *Real Party in Interest*

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences*

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences, which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

(3) *Status of Claims*

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) *Status of Amendments*

Amendment after final was filed.

(5) *Summary of claimed subject matter*

The summary of the claimed subject matter is contained in the brief.

(6) *Grounds of Rejection to be reviewed on appeal*

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 21-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection is set forth in a prior office action, mailed on 04-05-2006.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2143

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 21-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rakoshitz et al (U.S. 6,578,077 B1).

3. A per claims 21 & 29 Rakoshitz disclosed a method for operating a server group to improve bandwidth efficiency in a computer network, wherein the server group is operable to transmit files between the server group and destinations on the computer network through a communication link having a finite bandwidth (col.6, lines 3-13, the method comprising: monitoring bandwidth usage of a communication link for connecting a server group to a wide area network, using software operably associated with the communication link; distributing a rule set to individual servers of the server farm, wherein the rule set defines rules for limiting serving of data from the individual servers depending on file type and a current state of the bandwidth usage (col.9, lines 24-62); characterizing files stored in operable association with the individual servers according to type, using software operating on the individual servers (col.15, lines 42-56) ; informing the individual servers of the current state of the bandwidth usage as monitored by the software operably associated with the communication link; and serving the files from the individual servers to the wide area network via the communication link in compliance with the rule set, so as to limit serving of specified file types from the

Art Unit: 2143

servers during periods when the bandwidth usage exceeds a threshold amount relative to a finite bandwidth of the communication link (col.14, lines 57-62).

4. A per claims 22, 23 & 24 Rakoshitz disclosed the method of Claim 22, wherein the characterizing step further comprises characterizing a type of each of the files based on a corresponding file name extension for each file (col.14, lines 41-44 & col.15, lines 42-56).

5. A per claims 24 & 32 Rakoshitz disclosed the method of Claim 21, wherein the characterizing step further comprises crawling through a memory operably associated with the server to identify associated groups of files, wherein each of the groups of files is configured to be aggregated into a larger file (col.9, lines 24-62 & col.15, lines 42-67).

6. As per claims 25 & 33 Rakoshitz disclosed the method of Claim 21, wherein the characterizing step further comprises crawling through files stored in a storage device operably associated with the server to identify files that do not contain hyperlinks and are not identified by hyperlinks in other files stored by the storage device(col.9, lines 24-30 & col.15, lines 42-67).

7. A per claims 26 & 34 Rakoshitz disclosed the method of Claim 21, wherein the serving step further comprises selecting a rule from the rule set according to the current state of the bandwidth usage (col.9, lines 49-62)

8. A per claims 27 & 35 Rakoshitz disclosed the method of Claim 21, further comprising distributing a replacement rule set to individual servers of the server group when the current state of the bandwidth usage changes by more than a specified amount, wherein the replacement rule set replaces the rule set and defines rules for limiting serving of data from the individual servers depending on file type and a current state of the bandwidth usage (col.9, lines 24-62).

9. A per claims 28 & 36 Rakoshitz disclosed the method of Claim 21, further comprising repeating the informing step at periodic intervals (col.20, lines 42-65).

(7) Argument

The applicant argues the following issues regarding **claims 21-23, 26, 28-31, 34 & 36 (Group I); Claims 24 & 32 (Group II); Claims 25 & 33 (Group III) and Claims 27 & 35 (Group IV)** to support his position against the prior art Rakoshitz et al. U.S 6,578,077 B1.

(A) Rejection under 35 U.S.C 102(e) with regards to claims 21(Independent)-23, 26(Independent), 28-31, 34 & 36 (Group I)

Issue 1: The applicant on page 9 cited specific paragraphs from Rakoshitz and argued that bandwidth management tool disclosed by Rakoshitz is limited to being deployed at a single point, which is generally a gateway point.

As to applicant argument and citing of selective paragraphs from Rakoshitz on page 9 of the appeal brief, the examiner would like to state that applicant has overlooked alternate embodiments that Rakoshitz reference has mentioned that disclose the bandwidth management tool being deployed at various locations in the network.

Rakoshitz in an alternate embodiment on col.9 lines 27-38 clearly states:

“In a preferred embodiment, the bandwidth management tool 208 can be loaded onto a server without any changes to the hardware. In an alternate preferred embodiment, the tool can install, configure, and can operate on

Art Unit: 2143

a conventional IBM compatible PC running and operating system such as, for example, windows NT, but can be others. The tool can be deployed in any appropriate point in the network data path."

Additionally on col.8, lines 44-55 Rakoshitz again clearly states the following:

"For instance, the present bandwidth management tool can be applied at a network's Internet access link. Alternatively, the present tool can be applied to a private WAN link to a remote corporate site or an access to a server farm (e.g., a group of servers located in a special part of a network close to an access link, e.g., in a web hosting environment). Alternatively, the present invention can be applied to key servers (e.g., database/web servers) within an organization servicing internal and or external users. Furthermore, the present bandwidth management tool can be applied to any combination of the above or the like".

Examiner believes that the above verbatim citations from Rakoshitz should be sufficient in proving that bandwidth management tool can be deployed at multiple locations in a variety of network scenarios.

Art Unit: 2143

Issue 2: The applicant states (on page 10) that Rakoshitz does not disclose two separate software performing separate functions.

As to applicant's argument Rakoshitz explains on col.2, lines 66-67 & col.3, lines 1-15 that the bandwidth-profiling tool includes a variety of computer codes to form computer software or a computer program, which is stored in a computer memory. The program includes a **first code** that is directed to measuring a data rate for the flow of information from an incoming source, which is coupled to a network of computers. The program has a **second code** that is directed to categorizing the data rate from the flow of information based upon at least one of the plurality of traffic classes. Therefore Rakoshitz is clearly defining separate software codes that are performing separate functions.

Issue 2: The applicant states (on page 10) that Rakoshitz does not disclose distributing a rule set to individual servers of a group of server.

As to applicants argument the examiner would like to point to the statement by Rakoshitz on col.8, lines 44-55, which states the following:

"For instance, the present bandwidth management tool can be applied at a network's Internet access link. Alternatively, the present tool can be applied to a private WAN link to a remote corporate site or an access to a server farm (e.g., a group of servers located in a special part of a network close to an access link, e.g., in a web hosting environment). Alternatively, the present invention

can be applied to key servers (e.g., database/web servers) within an organization servicing internal and or external users. Furthermore, the present bandwidth management tool can be applied to any combination of the above or the like".

Therefore in the above discloser Rakoshitz clearly discloses distributing bandwidth management tool to various components of the network to include individual servers in various environments.

(B) Rejection under 35 U.S.C 102(e) with regards to dependent claims 24 & 32
(Group II)

Issue 1: Applicant argued that Rakoshitz does not disclose the limitation, which defines crawling through a memory operably associated with the individual server to identify associated groups of file.

As to applicants argument Rakoshitz on col.2, lines 66-67 & col.3, lines 1-15 discloses that a variety of computer codes performing various functionality are stored in the memory (RAM) portion of a computer (PC, Server or computing device) in a network. Rakoshitz further defines one of the functionality of the computer codes stored in the memory as being categorizing data based upon at least one of a plurality of traffic classes (Example, voice, video or data). Therefore Rakoshitz does disclose having the bandwidth controlling/profiling tool present in the memory of a network-computing device (e.g. PC, server etc).

Art Unit: 2143

(C) Rejection under 35 U.S.C 102(e) with regards to dependent claims 25 & 33
(Group III)

Issue 1: Applicant argued on page 13 that that Rakoshitz does not disclose any action identifying files that do not contain hyperlinks and are not identified by hyperlinks in other files stored by the storage device.

As to applicant's argument Rakoshitz on col.7, lines 61-67 & col.8, lines 1-4 discloses that the present invention can be used with a number of various files. For example , GIF, JPEG and MPEG, RA and AVI files.

(D) Rejection under 35 U.S.C 102(e) with regards to claims 27 & 35 (Group IV)

Issue 1: Applicant on page 14 merely states that Rakoshitz does not disclose the dependent claim 27.

As to applicant's argument Rakoshitz discloses the limitations of claim 27 on col.9, lines 24-62.

Art Unit: 2143

Issue 2: Applicant on page 14 again argues that bandwidth management tool disclosed by Rakoshitz is limited to being deployed at a single point, which is generally a gateway point.

As to applicants argument the examiner again states that on col.8, lines 44-55

Rakoshitz clearly states the following:

"For instance, the present bandwidth management tool can be applied at a network's Internet access link. Alternatively, the present tool can be applied to a private WAN link to a remote corporate site or an access to a server farm (e.g., a group of servers located in a special part of a network close to an access link, e.g., in a web hosting environment). Alternatively, the present invention can be applied to key servers (e.g., database/web servers) within an organization servicing internal and or external users. Furthermore, the present bandwidth management tool can be applied to any combination of the above or the like".

Examiner believes that the above verbatim citations from Rakoshitz should be sufficient in proving that bandwidth management tool can be deployed at multiple locations in a variety of network scenarios.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Art Unit: 2143

(8) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) Evidence appendix

6,578,077 B1	Rakoshitz et al.	06-2003
--------------	------------------	---------

(10) Related proceedings appendix

None.

Respectfully submitted,



Asghar. Bilgrami
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2143
November 15, 2006

Conferees



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100



WILLIAM VAUGHN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100